

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/663,102	09/16/2003	Hermann Henftling	18100	1632	
26794	7590 11/16/2004		EXAMINER		
TYCO ELECTRONICS CORPORATION 4550 NEW LINDEN HILL ROAD, SUITE 450			SOTOMAYO	SOTOMAYOR, JOHN B	
	NDEN HILL ROAD, 5	D, SOITE 430	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		3662		
			DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004	DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
-	10/663,102	HENFTLING ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	John B. Sotomayor	3662
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		•
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on		
	 s action is non-final.	•
3) Since this application is in condition for allowards closed in accordance with the practice under I	·	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) 11-18 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1.5-10.19 and 20 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 2-4 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 September 2003 is/ Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	are: a) \square accepted or b) \boxtimes objection drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is objection is	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). sected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burear * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	is have been received. Is have been received in Application In the second is a second in the second	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) ∐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		atent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/663,102 Page 2

Art Unit: 3662

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings filed October 21, 2003 are objected to because all boxes in the drawings should have descriptive legends attached to them. Therefore Figures 2a, 2b, and 2c should be labeled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1, 5, 7-10, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rittenbach ('812 or '655).

The claims are considered to be met by Rittenbach ('812 or '655) who discloses at least, inter alia, a sensor system for detecting an object including a signal source (phase modulator 28), an antenna system (10), and an information processor (computer 22). The Rittenbach ('812 or '655) clearly show I/Q processing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Application/Control Number: 10/663,102 Page 3

Art Unit: 3662

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rittenbach ('812 or '655) in view of Lewis et al ('478).

The invention is substantially disclosed by Rittenbach ('812 or '655) who disclose an object sensor system including, inter alia, a signal source, an antenna, and a processor. However, it appears that Rittenbach ('812 or '655) do not show providing a band pass filter.

Although bandpass filtering is well known in the radar art, Lewis et al ('478) is applied to show band pass filtering in a radar system (see bandpass filters 73 and 74 in Figure 10). The bandpass filter is well known for isolating desired signals within a specified frequency band.

Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a bandpass filter for the radar system of either Rittenbach ('812 or '655) as taught and as motivated by Lewis et al ('478) in order to process the radar returns to detect an object or target of interest.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 6. Claims 2-4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 7. Claims 11-18 are allowed.

Application/Control Number: 10/663,102 Page 4

Art Unit: 3662

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited prior art show various radar systems.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John B. Sotomayor whose telephone number is 703-306-4170. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom H. Tarcza, can be reached on 703-306-4171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John B. Sotomayor Primary Examiner Art Unit 3662